

Appl. No. 10/657,415  
Amdt. Dated 09/9/2005  
Reply to Office action of 06/14/2005

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 17-40 are pending in the present application.

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed June 14, 2005. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17-20, 31, 32, 36, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Applicants have amended claim 17. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

#### *Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102*

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17-20, 31, 32, 36, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lau (U.S. Patent No. 5,825,084). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and contend that the Examiner has not met the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of anticipation.

As the Examiner is aware, to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Vergegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

For instance, Lau does not disclose the first conductive strip wrapping around the first edge, namely from the inside surface of the first bond shelf to its top surface. In contrast, Lau discloses split-wrap around "SWA" (115') connectors that are electronically coupled to the contacts (110'), but does not wrap over the edge. See FIGs. 2A, 3D and 4C-4D.

Therefore, Applicant believes that independent claims 17, 31, 36, and their respective dependent claims are distinguishable over the cited prior art reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Appl. No. 10/657,415  
Amdt. Dated 09/9/2005  
Reply to Office action of 06/14/2005

**Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: September 9, 2005

By

  
William W. Schaal

Reg. No. 39,018

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:


**MAILING**

**FACSIMILE**

is deposited with the United States Postal Service as  
first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

☒ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and  
Trademark Office.

Date: 09/9/2005

  
Susan McFarlane

09/9/2005

Date